

Appl. No. 10/662,619
Amdt. dated December 4, 2007
Response to Office Action dated June 4, 2007

REMARK/ARGUMENTS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application in view of the following comments.

In the Office Action mailed June 4, 2007, claims 1-41, 48, 50-53, 55-57, 63, and 64 were examined and rejected as follows:

- Claims 1-22, 24-38, 40, 41, 48, 51, 53, 56, 57, 63, and 64 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as allegedly obvious over U.S. Patent Appl. Publ. No. 2001/0031669 to Ohama (the "Ohama publication").
- Claims 23 and 39 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as allegedly obvious over the Ohama publication in view of U.S. Patent Appl. Publ. No. 2001/0000506 to Sullivan (the "Sullivan publication").

Applicants believe these claims are allowable for the reasons discussed below.

The Rejection of Claims Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

As mentioned above, claims 11-22, 24-38, 40, 41, 48, 51, 53, 56, 57, 63, and 64 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as allegedly obvious over the Ohama publication and, in the case of claims 23 and 39, further in view of the Sullivan publication.

In her comments supporting the rejection of independent claims 1, 25, and 41, the Examiner asserted that the Ohama publication discloses all of features recited in these claims, including the use of pentachlorothiophenol (an organic sulfur compound) as a peptizer. The Examiner admitted that the Ohama publication only broadly discloses the use of pentachlorothiophenols, and does not disclose specific types such as metal salts or nonmetal salts. However, the Examiner stated that for purposes of the invention, the metal salts and nonmetal salts appear to be equivalents. The Examiner requested Applicants to provide scientific data showing the difference(s) between the golf balls comprising the metal salts versus golf balls comprising nonmetal salts. Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's assertions.

As admitted by the Examiner, the Ohama publication fails to disclose the use of a peptizer including a non-metal salt of an organic sulfur compound. Additionally, contrary to the

Appl. No. 10/662,619
Amdt. dated December 4, 2007
Response to Office Action dated June 4, 2007

For these reasons, the use of nonmetal salts of thiophenols and metal salts of thiophenols are not equivalents or interchangeable. Therefore, the § 103(a) rejection of independent claims 1, 25, and 41 is improper and should be withdrawn.

Claims 2-24, 48, and 50-52 all depend from independent claim 1, and claims 26-40, 53, 55-57, 63, and 64 depend from independent claim 25. These dependent claims all add features that more particularly define the invention and thus further distinguish over the cited Ohama and Sullivan references. These dependent claims, likewise, should be allowed.

Conclusion

This application should now be in condition for a favorable action. Allowance of the application is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference with Applicants' undersigned attorney of record might expedite prosecution of the application, she is invited to call at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

SHEPPARD, MULLIN, RICHTER & HAMPTON LLP

By:


Bridgette A. Agness
Registration No. 59,596

Sheppard, Mullin, Richter & Hampton LLP
333 South Hope Street, 48th Floor
Los Angeles, California 90071
Telephone: (213) 620-1780
Facsimile: (213) 620-1398